



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,484	09/13/2000	Manojit Sarkar	1384.011US1	2760
21186	7590	02/24/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH			JEAN, FRANTZ B	
1600 TCF TOWER			ART UNIT	
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET			PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2151	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/663,484	SARKAR, MANOJIT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frantz B. Jean	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/07/06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102{e} as being anticipated by Nicholson et al ("Nicholson") US patent Number 6,631,519 B1.

As per claim 1, Nicholson teaches a computerized method for managing router metadata (col. 4 lines 41 et seq), the method

Art Unit: 2151

comprising: Creating a metadata file, said metadata file defining objects in a router (col. 6 lines 49-57; col. 7 lines 9-13); reading the metadata file (col. 7 lines 9-13 and lines 58-60); converting the metadata file into an object model having at least one object (col. 7 lines 23-31); and loading the objects onto the router (implicit in Nicholson in order to route or switch the objects to other destination see col. 7 lines 23-31).

As per claim 4, Nicholson teaches a hash table of attributes names and attributes values (see col. 10, 11 and 15).

As per claim 5, Nicholson teaches converting a subset of metadata into object model (see col. 7 lines 23-31).

As per claim 6, Nicholson teaches comparing (matching) by the router the objects of the object model to a runtime object model (col. 2 lines 5-11); and updating the runtime object model with differences identified by the comparison (col. 9 lines 43-50; col. 1 lines 42-45).

As per claim 7, Nicholson teaches reading at runtime object model from the router (col. 7 lines 58 et seq); comparing the runtime object model to metadata and updating the metadata (see col. 2 lines 5-11; col. 9 lines 43-50; col. 1 lines 42-45; col. 7 lines 28-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson.

Art Unit: 2151

As per claim 3, Nicholson does not teach a file that comprises an ASCII formatted file. This feature is well known and expected in the art at the time of the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have known to use or incorporate a metadata file that comprises an ASCII format to convert characters (such as letters, numbers, decimal etc.) into digital form, thereby, facilitating communication among computers.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson in view of Schoening et al US patent Number 6,226,788 and Menzies et al. ("Menzies") US patent Number 6,317,748.

As per claim 2, Nicholson does not explicitly disclose SNMP MIB. Schoening discloses an extensible network management system, which includes SNMP and MIB (see Schoening col. 1 lines 37 et seq.). In addition, Menzies discloses management information of network devices by mapping between SNMP MIB module schema and common information model schema (see abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Schoening and Menzies SNMP MIB to Nicholson's metadata-based network router because it would have facilitated communication and objects management over the router and network connections (see Schoening col. 1 lines 38-42).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz B. Jean whose telephone number is 571-272-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 M-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571 272 3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz Jean



FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER